

PRESIDENT: Our hour expired on LB 518. We now go to 531. Mr. Speaker, is this also an hour? Alright.

CLERK: LB 531, Mr. President, is a bill introduced by the Appropriations Committee. (Read title to bill). Mr. President, ... have been referred directly to General File, so there are no committee amendments. There are a series of other amendments, however, offered to the bill. The first one is offered by Senator Warner, it is found on page 1517 of the Legislative Journal.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, perhaps if I follow the usual procedure and give a quick and brief description of the bill itself, then we can start and take up the amendments that are pending. In the case of the Supreme Court our recommendation is less than the agencies request, somewhat less than the Governor's approval. The difference between us and what the Governor recommended is in the area of federal funds, which I suspect we're going to deal with in more depth in the amendments, so I won't take time to do it at this time. One of the major reasons for reducing our request was that the Supreme Court generally had somewhere between a 10 and 12 percent increase in salaries. The policy that we applied for those was the same as other state employees, which is approximately that 5½ percent in terms of dollar amount. The same would be generally true of the district courts. Part of the difference is the application of the salary policy. Although, there was a request for the state to pick up a considerable number of probation officers. This we did not do. They are currently funded at the county level. The reason that we did not, this has been done before. As they are picked up the possibility exists to put a new one on at the county level so it doesn't necessarily result in any reduction for county officials. In addition there is a resolution that has been introduced, I believe it is LR 56, that covers this entire area of probation and to make significant changes at this time, depending upon the study, it seems like it would be an ill-advised time to do it. In the case of the Lieutenant Governor's Agency 08, it is the agency's request. In the case of the Secretary of State, essentially it was the agency's request, except we reduced from it the additional funds that they had requested, both in terms of equipment as well as a revolving fund dealing with microfilming. However, there is separate legislation that the committee has introduced, which has been reported out of the committee to General File to address that whole issue. Essentially, the Secretary of State is a continuation budget with the impact of microfilming being handled in separate legislation. In the case of the Auditor of Public Accounts, it is essentially the agency's request, although reduced from their request was approximately \$97,000 which was used in performance review by that agency. That, of course, is handled now by LB 193 which has already been enacted by the body. In the case of the Attorney General's office, we're slightly less than the request of the Governor, although earmarked in their funds is the continuation of \$40,000 for the water cases that are pending between us and Wyoming. Also there is earmarked General Fund money for an additional attorney with the provision that if there are funds from the Equal Opportunity Commission, federal funds, that they would be used instead. That probability is probably very good.